Orientals in the U. S.
1921

BULLETIN No. 67 OCTOBER 15th, 1914

The American-Japanese Problem

TWO ADDRESSES

BY

DR. SIDNEY L. GULICK

Professor in Doshisha University and Lecturer in the Imperial University, Kyoto, Japan

Representative on International Relations of The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America

A fresh and sane discussion of one of the greatest questions of the day. Prof. Gulick recognizes the justice of *California's demand* to be saved from danger of an overwhelming Asiatic immigration and also the *justice of Japan's demand* to be accorded treatment free from invidious race discrimination.

These apparently irreconcilable demands are met and fundamentally satisfied by the proposal of a New Immigration Policy that deals equally with all races.

The author has spent twenty-six years in Japan: for many years he was a professor in Doshisha University of Kyoto, and lecturer in the Imperial University.

Since January, 1914, Prof. Gulick has been speaking throughout the Eastern and Middle States on the Relations of America and Japan, as the representative of the Commission on Relations of America with Japan appointed by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. This organization includes thirty Protestant denominations, 136,000 churches, and some seventeen million adult members.

Copies of this bulletin (No. 67) of the Federal Council may be secured from the office (105 East 22d St., New York) on remittance of five cents. They may be had in bulk at $3.00 per hundred.

A BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE NEW IMMIGRATION POLICY.

America should admit as immigrants only so many aliens from any land as she can assimilate.

Assimilation however takes place largely by means of those already assimilated and naturalized, who know the languages, customs, and ideals of both peoples—ours and theirs.

All immigration should therefore be limited to a definite per cent. (say five) annually from each land of those already assimilated from that land. This rate would allow to enter all who might come from North Europe, would cut down immigration somewhat from South and East Europe, and allow only a slight immigration from Asia. This would avoid the objection of differential treatment of the nations and so be in equal harmony with the dignity of all.

Provision should also be made for the care and rapid assimilation of all who do come to America. It is therefore important to establish

A **Bureau of Registration**; all aliens to be and to remain registered until they become citizens. The annual registration fee should be, say $10.

Also a **Bureau of Education**—to set standards, prepare text books, and hold examinations free of charge. The registration fee should be reduced with every examination passed.

Also a **Bureau of Naturalization.** Certificates of graduation from the Bureau of Education and of good behavior from the Bureau of Registration should be essential to Naturalization.

All new citizens should take the oath of allegiance to the flag on the Fourth of July; on which day there should be processions with banners and badges, welcome orations and responses.

Eligibility to American citizenship should be based on personal qualification. The mere fact of race should be neither a qualification nor a disqualification.

Such a policy would completely solve, not only the perplexing Japanese problem, but also the dreaded Yellow Peril and the difficult problems connected with European immigration. It would put America right with all Asia; maintain and deepen our international friendship; and help to promote the uplift of China and secure our share of the enormous commerce which is to develop between China and the West in the near future.

LECTURE I.

A NEW IMMIGRATION POLICY.

The following lecture was delivered in substance before the Senate Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Jan. 31, 1914, *and at their request was written out in full and placed on record. Copies were presented to Sec. William J. Bryan and President Woodrow Wilson, both of whom granted Mr. Gulick interviews, February* 2, 1914. *Viscount Chinda, Ambassador from Japan, also requested copies for transmission to his Government in Tokyo. Statements by responsible Japanese warrant the belief that the general policy here outlined, including the restrictions of immigration here proposed, would be quite acceptable to the Japanese, since it is free from invidious race discrimination.*

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Senate Committee on Immigration:

I appreciate the honor of this opportunity to present certain considerations bearing upon America's Japanese problem.

In response to Senator Dillingham's request I begin with a few words of a personal nature.

A PERSONAL STATEMENT.

For twenty-six years I have been in Japan as a missionary of the American Board of the Congregational Churches. During my first two periods of service (nineteen years), I was engaged in the usual work of a missionary living in the interior. For the last seven years I have been located in Kyoto, having the chair of Systematic Theology in Doshisha University and also serving as stated Lecturer in the Imperial University of Kyoto in the Department of Comparative Religion.

These later years have brought me into contact with leading educators both in Kyoto and also in Tokyo. Because of the part which I took in the discussion which arose in connection with the so-called "Conference of the Three Religions" (February, 1912), really an official reception given by the Government to the heads of the twelve Shinto, fifty-four Buddhist and seven Christian bodies, I was brought into relation with a group of Japan's political leaders. Shortly after that the "Association Concordia" was organized, consisting of leaders in Education, Business and the Government, whose aim is the promotion of better mutual knowledge by the East and the West of each other's moral and spiritual life. Being one of the organizers of this Association, my acquaintance with Japan's leaders has been somewhat intimate.

I was in Japan when the recent anti-Japanese agitation and legislation took place in California and am familiar with its influence on the feelings of the people of Japan toward America.

As one of the organizers of the Oriental Peace Society of Kyoto—later united with the Peace Society of Tokyo to form the Peace Society of Japan, and as one of the Vice-Presidents from the beginning of the American Peace Society of Japan, I am familiar with the thought of Japanese and Americans who are interested in Peace.

I am familiar also with the thought of the American missionaries in Japan—over nine hundred—whose work in proclaiming the Gospel is seriously hindered by the rising suspicion and animosity between the two nations. They are deeply concerned not merely because it hampers their work, but still more because racial animosity is itself a contradiction to the central principles of the gospel which proclaims peace, good-will and universal human brotherhood.

Missionaries as individuals and in groups took action at that time, seeking to inform Americans as to the significance and probable result of California's proposed anti-Asiatic legislation. Resolutions and memorials were sent to America by letter and by cable. The Japan Mission of the American Board, for instance, sent a Memorial to the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America asking for the appointment of a Committee to study the entire Oriental problem from the standpoint of Christian statesmanship, with a view to guiding the churches and the American nation to the adoption of a truly Christian national policy.

Last July (1913) I returned to the States on my furlough. On reaching California, I spent three months studying the situation there. For I felt that only as I knew the facts from both sides—recognizing to the full, California's contentions and rights—would I be able to make any contribution to the solution of this most important, yet difficult problem. The result of that study is a volume now in the press on "The American Japanese Problem", in which I study with some fullness the entire question of the Racial Relations of the East and the West.

Not long after my arrival in America, I was invited by the Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches to attend a meeting in New York of its Commission on Missions in order to present more fully the subject matter of the Memorial sent in by the Japan Mission of the American Board. As a result of that and other conferences on the subject, I am now visiting leading cities under the auspices of the Federal Council to lay before the American people the problem with which America is confronted because of the rise of a New Asia.

The old attitude of the United States toward the Oriental is not suited to the new times in which we live. The true interests of America require the promotion of mutual friendship of Asia and America and the abandonment of differential race legislation.

Passing now to my main theme let me present considerations for urging that **America should give up her differential treatment of Asiatics.**

A New Asia.

Mankind has entered on a new era. Races and Civilizations for ages separated and self-sufficient are now face to face; their interests are rapidly commingling. New relations are being established between the East and West, between the masterful white nations and the hitherto peaceful and submissive peoples of Asia. The great races are proud, ambitious, determined. These qualities are part cause of their greatness.

Japan.

When Japan first came in contact with the white man (1553), she welcomed him. For sixty years she gave him full opportunity. About a million Japanese, it is believed, became Christian. Then when Japan learned of the white man's aggressions and ambitions for world conquest, she concluded that the white man meant a White Peril, to avoid which she turned him out, exterminated Christianity and for 250 years carried out her policy of exclusion most completely.

The Effect of Exclusion.

By that policy, however, she lost the stimulus of international relations and fell behind. In 1853 she woke to discover how belated and helpless she was, due to her exclusion policy. She wavered for a decade, suffered revolution brought on by different conceptions as to the right policy to take to the white man and finally late in the sixties adopted

Japan's New Policy

that namely of learning the secrets of the white man's power, in order to maintain national existence and honor on a basis of equality with the white man. This has been Japan's controlling ambition for fifty years. Her success, her war with Russia proclaimed. Japanese cannon at Mukden were heard around the world, proclaiming to the white man the end of his undisputed supremacy, and to the colored races the way in which to meet the White Peril. All Asia awoke to hope and effort.

Her Ambition.

Japan is not yet satisfied. National existence is indeed assured, provided she can maintain her military armament; she now has complete sovereignty within her own territories. But her citizens are not admitted to equal rights and opportunities with those of other lands—in America, Canada, New Zealand, Australia and British Africa. Her sense of national dignity is affronted. The limitation recently placed upon her by California, and the violent anti-Asiatic policy urged by the whole Pacific Coast has shocked and pained her deeply. Japan regards as highly humiliating all proposals to make general Asiatic exclusion laws.

Japan's Gratitude for American Friendship.

This situation is the more painful to her because until lately our relations have been so ideal, so helpful, so friendly. For decades she has been profoundly grateful to the United States. We brought her out of her long seclusion—watched patiently over her, guided her through those trying decades when she was first learning from the masterful white man the ways of the modern world. We protected her interests in international matters. We returned in 1883 the Shimonoseki Indemnity, amounting to $785,000.87. Thousands of Japanese students have had ideal treatment in our Christian homes and in our High Schools, Colleges and Universities. Our aid and support at the time of the war with Russia were invaluable to her and were highly appreciated. While there are doubtless jingoes in Japan who have uttered foolish words and threats, the prevailing temper of the people as well as of the Government, has been one of gratitude and persistent good-will. In spite of recent rebuff and unkind words and treatment there is a remarkable spirit of patience and moderation. They are still proceeding with expensive plans for the Panama Exposition at San Francisco.

Deeply Wounded, but Still Hoping.

Japan is still hoping that some method will be found of providing for California's just demands without subjecting her to humiliation. She has taken at its face value, the first treaty she ever made with a white race, namely with America, which reads:—"There shall be perfect, permanent and universal peace and sincere and cordial amity between the United States and Japan and between their people respectively, without exception of persons and places." This friendship solemnly pledged, has been loyally

carried out by Japan. But it cannot be denied that her friendly feelings and her admiration for America have considerably cooled. Many indeed are indignant; all are waiting eagerly to learn if America as a whole will support the anti-Asiatic policy so urgently pressed by Pacific Coast legislators and agitators.

Japan is Misunderstood.

There is wide misunderstanding in California and in America as a whole as to what Japan asks. She does not ask for free immigration for her laborers. She recognizes that any large entrance of Japanese into California would produce both economic and racial difficulty. She is ready to do whatever may be needful consistent with national honor and dignity to save America from embarrassment on both lines, as her faithful administration of the "Gentlemen's Agreement" witnesses. She is willing to continue holding back all Japanese laborers from coming to this country.

What Japan Earnestly Pleads For.

What Japan does ask and asks earnestly is that there shall be no invidious and humiliating race legislation which shall involve her fair name. Japan stands for national honor in international relations. For this she has been strenuously striving for half a century. Is she not to be respected for it? Is not this sensitiveness and insistence one of the evidences that she deserves it? **Economic opportunity in California is not her primary interest or insistence but recognition of manhood equality.** Is not the honor of an individual or a nation of more importance than everything else? Is the maintenance of friendship possible between two nations when one insists on humiliating the other?

China.

For ages China was so vast, preponderant, self-sufficient and self-satisfied that she simply ignored the white man when he appeared on her horizon. Even the wars by which England forced opium on China did not apparently disturb her much.

But when port after port was taken by foreign powers; when Germany took Kiao Chao for the killing of two missionaries; and when Russia took Port Arthur after it had been forced back from Japan; and when foreigners were gaining mining rights and railroad concessions throughout China, Chinese began to realize that something must be done, or they would soon cease to exist as a self-governing people.

Failure of China's Exclusion Policy.

China's first reaction was like Japan's (and incidentally California's), namely, a policy of exclusion. That brought on the Boxer uprising (1900). It was however, too late. The armies of the Allies relieved Pekin and proved to China that the White man and Western civilization could neither be excluded nor ignored. They imposed upon her as penalty an indemnity, far in excess of expenses, amounting to $687,566,705.

China Learns from Japan.

After a few years of vacillation, confusion, turmoil and revolution, came Japan's victory over Russia (1905), which announced to the world that a colored race can hold its own against the white man and that the way by which to do it is to learn all that the white race knows. China listened and learned.

One month after Japan made peace with Russia, China abolished her system of classical education, over 2000 years old, and started on the new policy. Since then China has been introducing western education, western science, western political life at a tremendous rate. The Manchu dynasty is gone. The characteristic Chinese queue is gone from large sections of China. We now have a new China, ambitious, energetic, resourceful, progressive and becoming self-conscious. Her young men are in all the capitals of Christendom learning western ways. As a short cut to western knowledge tens of thousands of Chinese students have studied in Japan.

Some decades will doubtless be needed before China will reach the stage of occidentalization already reached by Japan. But she will get there as surely as time moves onward.

China's Friendship for America.

At present America holds an enviable position in China. Above all other nations we are recognized as having been her friend. We have never seized a foot of her territory nor squeezed her for indemnities. On the contrary our dealings over there at least, have been friendly and helpful. We helped her at the critical time of the Boxer uprising. We are remitting annually a part of our share of the Boxer indemnity, amounting in all by 1940 to nearly $40,000,000. We would have no part in the grasping Six-Power loan; we were the first to recognize the Republic. Our missionaries throughout China have displayed that char-

acteristic spirit of American democracy which wins the common man. The new Chinese education is practically in the hands of Americans. China is cordially our friend and admirer to-day, as Japan was for several decades.

Will America Retain China's Friendship?

But how long will this last? When China secures inner political stability, a system of popular education, newspapers in every city and telegraphic communication with the world, and has the news of the world at sunrise as Japan has, and when China learns that in spite of all her history, national prestige, power and progress, her citizens in America are subjected to indignities and treatment accorded to those of no European people,—not because of personal defect or wrong, but wholly because of race; when she learns that for decades Chinamen in America were helpless victims of local race antagonism, were indeed on occasion even murdered, and that nevertheless the United States as such never sought to aid or protect them and never attempted even to punish the guilty murderers; and when China as a nation awakes to the fact that America has made no effort to keep her treaties with China; when she learns that America promised in a solemn treaty that "Chinese laborers now (1880) in the United States . . shall be accorded all the rights, privileges, immunities, and exceptions which are accorded to the citizens and subjects of the most favored nation" and yet that the authorities at Washington allowed California to deprive Chinese subjects in that state of the right to buy and sell land or to lease it on terms allowed to other aliens; when China learns these things, as learn them she will in time, is it likely that Chinese friendship for, and trust in America, will be maintained? And when China learns that America, like all the other peoples holding Canada, Australia and South Africa, has established high walls of exclusion based entirely on race grounds, is she likely to be quite complacent?

Is it not altogether likely rather that China will follow in Japan's footsteps; the friendship will cool down; disappointment will follow disappointment, until friendship changes to animosity, good-will to enmity?

"The Yellow Peril."

Many in this country and Europe are already looking forward to the day when all Asia, united and armed as Japan is to-day, shall confront the white

man. If the white races follow the policy of Asiatic exclusion and disdain, grounded exclusively on race difference, will not our attitude evoke a corresponding attitude on the part of Asiatics? But if enmity widely prevails in Asia against the white man there will also be wide suspicion and many unfriendly deeds; and these will be doubly reciprocated by the West. And because of this condition there will be felt in both East and West the need of progressive armament to preserve peace and prevent attack.

The present policy, therefore, so widely adopted by the white race, in Canada, on our Pacific Coast, in New Zealand, Australia and British Africa, the policy of invidious differential racial treatment, and of holding these vast, sparcely peopled continents for exclusive opportunity for the white man, regardless of the conditions, needs or abilities of the other races, this, I say, is a policy fraught with grave danger.

This condition is already being discussed by Orientals. They call it

"The White Peril."

If you want to see how Japan feels on this question listen to this utterance of Professor Nagai in his recent article on the "White Peril:"

"If one race assumes the right to appropriate all the wealth, why should not the other races feel ill-used and protest? If the yellow races are oppressed by the white races and have to revolt to avoid congestion and maintain existence, whose fault is it but the aggressors? If the white races truly love peace and wish to preserve the name of Christian nations they will practice what they preach and will soon restore to us the rights so long withheld. They will rise to the generosity of welcoming our citizens among them as heartily as we do theirs among us. We appeal to the white races to put aside their race prejudice and meet us on equal terms in brotherly co-operation."

The above quotation is from a long article published in Japan last May.

Some three years ago while lecturing in the Imperial University of Kyoto, the Secretary of the Young Men's Buddhist Association brought me a letter from the Secretary of the Young Men's Hindu Association of Calcutta describing the evil deeds of the white race and asking if Hindu and Japanese young men should not combine to oppose the white man and to drive him out.

Last August (1913) a summer school was held in Osaka under the auspices of the great daily, the "Morning Sun" (Asahi). One of the addresses was delivered by A. Dharmapala on "Japan's Duty to the World." I give a few quotations.

"Islam destroyed India, Christian England demoralized China . . Only Japan escaped these destructive icebergs. . . It is the white peril that the Asiatic races have to fight against. . . The White peril is a reality, the Yellow Peril is only a phantom. . . How are we to subdue the arrogance of the white races? . . Japan by her superior morality subdued the most powerful of European nations."

These discussions are but mutterings now and the feelings they represent may still be allayed. If we treat the Asiatic with a consideration for his needs and welfare, if we help him to walk in the modern ways, and aid him in maintaining his sovereignty and national dignity, we shall unquestionably win and hold his friendship. There will then be no white peril for him and no yellow peril for us.

But if we disregard his problems, his needs, his ambitions, and his dignity; if our first aim is white race supremacy established by force, with a crushing heel on the yellow man's head; if we give him no fair share or opportunity in the world's great store house; if we humiliate him, and insist on certain disqualifications regardless of personal character or ability, disqualifications based entirely on race, then the future relations of East and West are indeed ominous.

The Economic Yellow Peril.

The yellow peril is not exclusively military. To some, the economic aspect is even more serious. When all Asia is fully awake, educated in modern science, equipped with factories, railroads, steamships and mines, what will become of our commerce, and of our industrial classes? Will not Asia by her low standard of life put up an invincible industrial competition? Will she not pull us down to her level? Can we permanently maintain a high scale of life against a world living on a low level? That is a problem for economists.

But one or two things I think I can say. The solution of this problem, both for us and for them, can be found far more easily on a basis of friendship than of enmity between East and West. We can solve our own economic problem more certainly if neither they nor we are crushed by the excessive military expenses which would be inevitable if the fear of the military yellow and white perils are rampant.

And further, no small part of the solution consists in raising the ideals and scale of life among Asia's millions. By raising their manhood and their entire mode of life—the economic competition will be diminished. This is visibly beginning to take place in Japan. The cost of living has doubled there the past decade. Moreover in proportion as the higher standard and scale of life arises will Asia's purchasing power from us advance, with all that that signifies.

Now it is not hard to see that the best conditions under which to elevate the masses of Asia and bring them up to our level is on a basis of friendliness. Help them to learn. Let them come and live among us and go back, carrying with them their new ideas and ideals. Set the best possible conditions for the promotion of the knowledge of the Heavenly Father, of man's own divine nature and of the universal brotherhood. These are the great creative ideas which lift individuals and peoples to higher levels of life and to nobler manhood. Even though for wholly selfish reasons, we wish to lift Asia, these are the means by which to do it. In imparting these ideas, it will be a great thing if missionaries in China can point to America with pride and say, "there is the land where those ideas are being carried out, not only in the relations of private life, but in business and industry and also in international relations."

Inability to make this statement to-day, except in a limited way, is probably the most serious obstacle to the propagation of the Gospel in non-Christian lands. Increasingly difficult will the missionary work become if there is rising racial animosity and injustice. For the very substance of the Gospel is thereby denied by the conduct of these peoples who know the Gospel ideal most completely.

California's Just Demands.

A fair statement of the case, however, demands also full appreciation of California's situation. Were immigration as freely granted to Asiatics, as has been to Europeans, the Pacific Coast states would undoubtedly be invaded by millions in the course of a few years. Coming by the hundred thousand annually, they could not learn our language, nor we theirs. Assimilation and mutual understanding would be impossible. The result would be Asiatic and American institutions and customs struggling side by side, an imperium in imperio, with endless rivalry and serious danger of collision. California is absolutely right in her demand that she shall be free from such a danger.

Only those immigrants should be allowed to enter, reside permanently and own land in California or anywhere in the United States who can become citizens and be completely assimilated.

The Solution of America's Oriental Problem.

Since therefore differential race treatment on the one hand must be given up and since on the other hand free Asiatic immigration is not to be tolerated, it would seem as though we were involved in an insoluble problem, caught on the horns of a dilemma. In reality, however, the problem is not so difficult as it appears. The alternatives are not free immigration or complete exclusion.

Since we must limit Asiatic immigration, and since we must also treat all races equally, it follows that we must limit all immigration. It follows likewise that we must find some method or principle which, applied equally to all, will secure the needed results. We find this in an immigration law which bases limitation on the principle of assimilability.

An immigration law which treats all races exactly alike—this, and this alone, is friendly. A law which admits only so many annually as we can reasonably expect to assimilate—this preserves our institutions and provides that the white man's land shall remain white in civilization and control.

And these two provisions lead on to a third, namely—provision that those who are admitted to our country shall be aided in the process of assimilation. In other words we need to provide for the rapid and certain assimilation of those who do enter. For our own sake, as well as for those who come to us, we cannot afford to have any considerable population residing in our midst but taking no essential part in our national life.

We should admit into the United States as immigrants only as many aliens from any land as we can expect to assimilate. Assimilation, however, takes place largely by means of those already assimilated and naturalized, for they know the languages, customs, ideals, political and social life of both peoples, theirs and ours, and the processes they themselves have passed through in becoming Americans.

All immigration therefore should be limited to a definite per cent per annum from each people, of those from that people already assimilated (naturalized) with American born children of the first generation. Five per cent suggests itself as a suitable rate with which to begin the experiment.

In order to present my proposition with as much definiteness as possible, I have formulated it in the shape of

A Proposed Amendment

to the present Immigration Law.

Be it enacted, etc., That Section 2 of the Immigration Act of February 20, 1907, shall be amended by the addition of the following improviso:

Provided, That the number of aliens of any race (single mother tongue group), who may be admitted to the United States in any fiscal year shall be limited to five per cent of the number of native-born persons of the first generation, together with the number of naturalized citizens, of that race in the United States at the time of the national census next preceding; except that aliens reurning from a temporary visit abroad; aliens coming to join a husband, wife, father, mother, son, daughter, grandfather, grandmother, grandson, or granddaughter; aliens who are government officers, and aliens who are travelers or visitors and who do not engage in any remunerative occupation or business in the United States, shall not be included within the five per cent limit above provided. Provided, further, That all laws relative to the exclusion of Chinese persons or person of Chinese descent are hereby repealed.

This, gentlemen, is a proposition that no doubt seems to you chimerical, yet it is in fact the only policy really practical. So important are the principles upon which this proposal is based that I venture to emphasize them.

The Fundamental Postulates

which underlie the proposed immigration policy are:

1. That the United States shall treat all races on a basis of equality; that there shall be no invidious or humiliating treatment of any race. This does not mean, however, nor necessitate, a policy of wide open doors to all races—a policy of free unrestricted immigration.

2. That we can wisely admit into our country for permanent residence only so many aliens and of such peoples as we can assimilate. Any other policy is fraught with danger. We cannot consent to the permanent presence in our land of alien populations, who will be as cancers in our body-politic—in us but not of us.

3. That the number whom we can confidently expect to assimilate yearly depends in some close way on

the number of those already assimilated. Those born abroad, who have, however, been here long enough to learn our language and our political life and to accept our ideals are the ones to exert wholesome influence on newcomers from their own native people. They constitute the natural channel by which the newcomers enter our life. The larger the number of naturalized citizens from any particular foreign people, the larger the number whom we can safely admit from that people. This then is a ratio—a matter of per cent.; I suggest 5%. I am not however, particularly concerned with the 5% number, but only with the principle and with its equal application to every foreign people.

Certain questions will at once arise.

Points of Difficulty.

(a) How can we settle what a "single mother tongue group" is? There is a certain amount of theoretical difficulty here; but the general principle is clear. A German or Egyptian Jew, though completely assimilated, would be of no particular aid in assimilating a Polish Jew. The central principle is the power of those already assimilated from a particular foreign group to serve as an assimilating agency for later comers from that group. For this they must have belonged, in a not distant past, to the same social group and must still have ability to speak the same language.

The determination of the names and boundaries of such groups might be left either to the Bureau of Immigration or to the Department of Ethnology.

(b) The Federal Census does not show how many naturalized citizens there are. This is certainly a difficulty, but it can easily be remedied at the next census. In the meantime the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization could be instructed to make estimates, which estimates could be used as a working basis until the next census gives the correct figures.

(c) What would be the effect of this 5% rate on present immigration?

I have devoted considerable study to this question, and offer the following figures. Columns 1-3 are taken bodily from the last Federal Census. Column 4 is taken from the Report on Immigration, being the sum for the past ten years. I assume for column 5, that the deaths and departures of those admitted as immigrants has been 20%. I assume still further that of those immigrants who have come to us in the past ten years, 40% have naturalized, leaving 60% who are still aliens—column 6. The

difference between columns 3 and 6 gives the number of estimated naturalized citizens and American-born children, column 7. Column 8 is 5% of column 7, the maximum number of possible annual immigrants. For purposes of comparison I have placed beside it the actual immigration for 1912.

If these assumptions are regarded as fairly plausible and the calculations have been correct, we reach the result that the proposed 5% rate would allow full immigration from north Europe and cut down very considerably immigration from south Europe.

Country	Foreign born	American born children, one or both parents foreign.	Total foreign White stock.
	1.	2.	3.
Germany	2,500,000	5,780,000	8,280,000
Great Britain ..	2,570,000	5,160,000	7,730,000
Scandinavian ..	960,000	1,490,000	2,450,000
Russia	1,730,000	1,020,000	2,750,000
Italy	1,340,000	750,000	2,090,000
Austria	1,670,000	1,030,000	2,700,000
China	56,000	14,775	
Japan	67,000	4,410	

Country	Immigration Past Decade	Estimated Deaths and Departures	Estimated Resident Aliens
	4.	5.	6.
Germany	350,000	70,000	168,000
Great Britain ..	958,000	191,000	459,000
Scandinavian ..	491,000	98,000	235,000
Russia	1,725,000	345,000	822,000
Italy	2,071,000	414,000	993,000
Austria	2,097,000	419,000	1,006,000
China			56,000
Japan			67,000

Country	Estimated Citizens and Children	Possible Annual Immigration	Actual Immigration 1912
	7	8	9
Germany	8,112,000	405,600	27,788
Great Britain ..	7,270,000	363,500	82,979
Scandinavian ..	2,215,000	110,750	27,550
Russia	1,928,000	96,400	162,395
Italy	1,097,000	54,850	157,134
Austria	1,694,000	84,700	178,882
China	14,775	738	
Japan	4,410	220	

(d) What would be the effect on Asiatic Immigration?

Chinese.

Since there are over 14,000 American-born Chinese in the United States, the 5% rate would allow over 700 Chinese immigrants annually. During 1913, over 6,000 Chinese citizens entered America in harmony with the present exclusion laws, consisting chiefly of those who return and relatives. It is generally admitted that quite a number smuggle their way in. It is a fair question whether the opening of the door to the extent of 5% would not serve to diminish the number of those who smuggle their way in. As soon as China gains the new administrative efficiency which her internal reforms are securing, would she not co-operate more loyally in administering a 5% rate, than in enforcing the complete exclusion laws now on our statutes?

Japanese.

The 5% rate would allow about 220 to enter yearly. Of the 6,859 Japanese arrivals during the last fiscal year, 6715 brought passports acceptable to our officials under the present "Gentleman's Agreement," while 144 brought passports not regarded as satisfactory. But under the circumstances it was impossible to deport them. Of the 6715 arrivals, 5920 come within the number for whom special exception is made in all treaties, such as relatives and those returning after an absence. Within the remaining 753 are included travelers, visitors, students provided with means of support and others, who would also be admitted in any case. Skilled laborers and professionals who plan to make a living by some remunerative occupation, would be affected by the proposed 5% rate. But in any case the number affected is not large.

In this brief discussion I have of course considered only the question of immigration. Of equal importance, however, is the question of Asiatic assimilability and also the question of aiding all immigrants in such wise as to promote their rapid and wholesome incorporation into our national life. I regret that lack of time forbids their discussion, for upon these matters also I have much that I would like to say.

Summary Statement.

If my argument has been correct, the new world situation and especially the New Asia requires of America changes in her international policies, especially as they concern the Orient. The continuance of flat Asiatic exclusion—which was possible and probably necessary in the nineteenth century—promises to

bring serious disaster. A policy of restricted immigration, of general application, looking to the welfare of Asia as well as our own, together with adequate provision for the assimilation to our ideals and life of all who come to our shores, will alone secure those right and helpful relations which will promote the permanent peace and prosperity of both East and West.

America is the only country in the world to which is offered the opportunity of mediating thus between the East and the West. Our conduct during the next few decades seems likely to settle for centuries to come the relations of East and West. This question may possibly be hanging in the balance for a half century. The longer we delay starting upon the friendly and helpful course, the greater will be our difficulty in carrying it out and overcoming the anti-white suspicion and enmity already existing in the Orient and bound to grow with every decade of delayed justice.

In closing, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen of the Committee, let me thank you most heartily for this opportunity to express some of the considerations which seem important not only to myself alone but to those whom I represent.

[In the course of the address many questions were asked and answered. It has seemed better, in preparing this account of what was said, to bring all these questions and answers together at the close.]

Question. Does not Japan demand of us what she does not grant to others? Does she not exclude Chinese laborers?

Answer. Japan has, indeed, deported Chinese laborers but not because of Chinese exclusion laws: All her laws relating to foreigners are general and apply to all races and nations equally. In a few cases Chinese laborers have been deported because of infringement of departmental regulations requiring that in every case before foreign labor is brought in special permission shall be secured. What Japan objects to in our laws is invidious race legislation. She takes no exception to any legislation which treats all aliens alike.

Question. Does not Japan demand rights for land ownership for her citizens in California which she does not grant to foreigners in Japan?

Answer. No, I think not. Any foreigners in Japan if they form a corporation and are legally incorporated (Ho-jin, Juridical Person) have exactly the same rights in every respect that are granted to

a Japanese corporation. Not so with California's laws; there, no corporation the majority of whose members are Asiatics may purchase or hold land. In Japan, a private individual may not indeed as yet purchase land in fee simple. But he is allowed to lease for indefinite periods. Many foreigners—I among them—have leases that run for 999 years with the clause added that in case the laws are changed at any time, the deed shall be changed to fee simple ownership without additional payment. Since all deeds have to be recorded in the Government land office and must be sanctioned to be valid, this form of land ownership is recognized as legal by the Government. The California law in contrast to this, does not allow Asiatics to lease land for periods exceeding three years. In any case, however, Japanese land laws relating to aliens treat all races on a basis of absolute equality.

But it is not to be forgotten that more than three years ago the Diet passed a new land law providing among other things for the fee simple ownership of land by foreigners from countries which grant the same right to Japanese. Certain investigations, however, had to be carried out before it could go into effect, which apparently have not yet been completed.

Question. How did it happen that fee simple ownership was not granted at the beginning of foreign intercourse?

Answer. For three hundred years Japanese, in absolute ignorance about foreigners, came to believe almost every evil thing about them. When Japan was first opened, only the most restricted privileges could be granted them because of violent race prejudice. The Government had to take and did take extraordinary precautions to secure to foreigners the safety and the rights provided for by the treaties. As Japan learned the ways of white men and began to trust them, the restrictions were gradually relaxed, the Government being ahead of the people as a rule and ever teaching them When the final relaxation was made at the close of the nineties, and foreigners were allowed free travel without passports many Japanese expected a great overwhelming flood to sweep through the interior. It was believed that if the right to fee simple ownership was given to foreigners, they would buy up every good piece of property in the country. Their anxiety was far keener than has been that of California regarding Japanese land purchase in that State.

Question. Is not Japan over-sensitive, threatening to go to war over little matters. Is she not over

solicitous about her national honor; does she not get insulted too easily. America for instance, because Russia refused to accord to American Jews traveling in Russia the rights we demand, simply cancelled the treaty—but there is not a particle of thought that we would go to war with Russia.

Answer. That is a very good question and a good illustration also. America abrogated the treaty with Russia because she felt that **her national dignity** was involved in the treatment given by Russia to American Jews. We will not allow, without protest, invidious or humiliating treatment of even one class of our citizens. In the case of Japan, her whole citizenship is involved on a race issue.

But there is another consideration to be borne in mind. **Japan has made no threat of war nor even intimated it.** In this respect likewise she resembles America, in the attitude to Russia.

It is well to remember that the talk of war between Japan and America has emanated wholly from sources on this side of the Pacific. There are sinister forces which utilize the Japan war-scare with which to promote their own interests. Japan knows that war with America across the Pacific is practically impossible. Moreover, Japan earnestly wishes to have friendship with us—far more than we do with Russia. Japan knows all too well that her future political skies are by no means free from clouds. Her fleet and army are maintained **wholly without reference to the United States.**

Of course there have been jingoes in Japan, who have caught up the war talk—but it first came from Europe and then from America. But the boasting or threatening words of a few irresponsible disturbers of the peace should not be mistaken for the intention of an entire nation.

Question. Was there not high excitement widespread in Japan over the California question?

Answer. I think I should say no to that. In Tokyo where most of the jingoes and small politicians congregate there was excitement and some hot talk. But there never was any mob of any size surging through the streets of Tokyo demanding war—as was asserted by certain alleged telegrams that appeared in the American press. In Kyoto, Osaka, Kobe and elsewhere there were public meetings to hear what might be said on the subject. I spoke at the meeting in Kobe. There was not a particle of excitement. My line of discussion was to the effect that California was not wholly without

reason. The presence of so many Japanese in California did create a problem. That we in Japan did not have sufficiently accurate knowledge of the California situation to pass any final judgment. But that if the California State law contravened the treaty the courts would rule the law unconstitutional.

In this connection, I wish to speak of the grave injury that is being done to both Japan and America by the irresponsible statements in the press regarding the motives and actions of each country. Every evil suspicion and surmise apparently is voiced as assured news. Only last Wednesday (Jan. 28) two Senators (names not given of course) were quoted by the "Washington Post" as saying that they had positive information that the Japanese Government was aiding the Mexican Government with arms in order to embarrass our Government. This statement was positively denied by President Wilson a couple of days later, but the story served to do its share of the work in making both countries suspicious of each other. I regard as one of the most serious dangers to the right relations of Japan and America, the irresponsible and apparently maliciously fabricated "news" that finds such ready utterance in so many of our papers. The only real "yellow peril" today is the "yellow press."

Question. Do you think you can legislate race prejudice out of existence?

Answer. Of course not. But wise legislation should be based on facts, not on the fictions alleged as facts by race-prejudice. Continuous education and just administration, I doubt not, will gradually overcome race-prejudice. Race-prejudice arises from ignorance. Its only cure is education.

Question. Is there not a fundamental difference of race between Asiatic and Caucasian so that assimilation is impossible and inter-marriage intolerable?

Answer. This is a large question, to which I have devoted three chapters in my forthcoming book on The American-Japanese Problem. I there distinguish between biological and social heredity and inheritance

Sociologically speaking, Asiatics are as assimilable as any people; but we must take them in small numbers, provide for their education in English, and give them opportunity such as we give to other nationalities.

The results of inter-marriage have not been sufficiently investigated to enable us to speak with certainty. Immoral inter-marriages are certainly bad. Inter-marriage preceding social assimilation is to be highly deprecated. My thought is that a commission

on the Problem of Race Assimilation should be established consisting of expert biologists, psychologists and sociologists. After exhaustive scientific examination, if it is found that race inter-marriage is harmful, as is popularly believed, a national law forbidding it should be enacted. The problem of "race purity" may and should be kept distinct from that of immigration, as Pres. Eliot so clearly shows in his Report to the Carnegie Peace Foundation.

LECTURE II.

THE AMERICAN JAPANESE PROBLEM.

The following lecture presents in the briefest possible form some of the principal points discussed in Mr. Gulick's volume having the above title. He there considers at length the Racial Relation of the East and West which is widely recognized as the most important world-problem of the twentieth century. He also takes up in detail California's experience with Japanese together with the question of Japanese Assimilability. In this lecture, after considering the world situation suggested by the terms "Yellow and White Perils", and after discussing briefly the problem of Japanese assimilability, he not only presents more fully his proposals as to immigration, but also as to methods of assimilation.

THE AMERICAN JAPANESE PROBLEM.

"Asia is a sleeping giant", said Napoleon; "let her sleep, for when she wakens she will shake the world." That prophecy is now coming true. Events mighty and significant are crowding upon us. The situation is dramatic and threatens to become tragic.

Man's modern mastery of nature with the practical collapse of space have created a new world situation. Races and civilizations, for ages self-sufficient, proud, ambitious, determined, are now face to face. Shall mutual misunderstandings, suspicions, aggressions, resentments, indignation, with mutual exclusion between East and West, grow ever more acute, culminating in fierce military conflict? Shall eight hundred millions in Asia, united and armed with Western science, bayonets and battleships, be pitted in race war against the white nations of Christendom armed to the teeth?

Such is the dread "Yellow Peril" which many already anticipate, and for which they would have Christendom prepare. But is there not some alternative, some better way? If so, what is it? My discussion falls into three sections:

1. The Perils—Yellow and White
2. Are Japanese Assimilable?
3. A New American Oriental Policy.

I. THE PERILS—YELLOW AND WHITE.

Whites in America number approximately ninety million; Japanese and Chinese each about 70,000; yet we face an ominous racial situation.

California, in fear of the economic competition of Asiatic labor and of a swamping invasion of Asiatic civilization, demands legislation providing for complete Asiatic exclusion. She urges also vast expenditures for military preparations on the Pacific coast.

British America likewise, and Australia, New Zealand, and British Africa have been seized with like fear of Asiatic immigration and military invasion. In each of these lands the white man has raised high walls of Asiatic exclusion. The wide continents he now possesses he proposes to keep for the white man's ownership; their unlimited natural resources he intends to reserve for the white man's use. Of the

needs or rights of the yellow and black man he has no consciousness, and (should I add?) apparently no sense of responsibility.

For several hundred years the white man has regarded himself as ordained to own and rule the world; to take by force, if need be, and make his own whatever he desired. Practically unhindered, he swept over America, North and South, Africa, India, Australia, New Zealand, and Siberia. To uncounted millions of the native peoples of these lands the white man has proved a terrible scourge. He has ruthlessly destroyed, not only tribes and peoples, but entire civilizations. For centuries he has been a veritable "White Peril" to races of other color than his own.

To escape the "White Peril" Japan deliberately shut herself away from the rest of the world for 250 years. Only when she could no longer protect herself by the method of exclusion did she adopt the new policy of learning and using what the white man knows. Her success in this policy the Russo-Japanese war proclaimed.

Japanese cannon at Port Arthur, Mukden and in the Japan Sea were heard, not only by the grim combatants, but also in every European capitol. They spoke with no uncertain sound. They proclaimed an end to the white man's unquestioned domination of the world. Their proclamation was heard likewise throughout Asia and Africa, giving fresh hope to races that have quailed before the white man.

One month after the signature of the Portsmouth treaty of peace China abolished her system of classical education, over 2000 years old, and adopted the policy which Japan has found so hopeful—the mastery of the world's best knowledge. Today, accordingly, we have a new China; the Manchu rulers have gone; a new national consciousness has arisen, with mighty ambitions and plans; China is waking to international life. She recognizes how serious is her plight. She is reorganizing her political, industrial, commercial, social, and even her intellectual life. She proposes no longer to be a weak belated people, the object of exploitation by all the other nations of the world. With Japan she plans to place herself beside the white man as at least his equal, with power to decide her own destiny.

But from the white man's standpoint the "Yellow Peril" is not only a matter of inundating immigration or mighty military invasion; it takes the form also of the keenest possible economic competition. When Asia with its low standard of living and with its teem-

ing millions of highly developed laborers begins to manufacture for herself the goods we now send her, where will our commerce be? And when she produces, far cheaper than we can, the manufactured goods we use, what will become of our industries, and of our working classes? Shall we not all be forced down to the Asiatic scale of life?

From the Japanese standpoint, on the other hand, the "White Peril" is taking on a new form. Through the adoption of Western science, hygiene and medicine, and through the acceptance of the Occidental estimate of the value of human life and the wide abandonment of infanticide, population is growing apace, as never before in her history. In the face of this growing population in a land already densely crowded, expansion to open territories is practically impossible. For the white nations have taken and hold such land for exclusive white ownership.

Moreover, the treatment of the Japanese in some parts of Christendom is galling to their pride and national dignity. California's recent anti-alien legislation has deeply wounded the entire Japanese people. Until the most recent years Japan has placed implicit confidence in the first article of the first treaty made with America in 1854, the first treaty with any foreign land: "There shall be a perfect, permanent and universal peace and a sincere and cordial amity between the United States and Japan and between their peoples, respectively, without exception of persons or places." This friendship, pledged between America and Japan sixty years ago, has been keenly and highly appreciated by Japan, but now it is considerably cooled. In truth, Japan is indignant, and is eagerly waiting to learn if, as a whole, America will support the anti-Asiatic policy so urgently pressed by California.

Professor Nagai, in his article last May on the "White Peril", says: "If one race assumes the right to appropriate all the wealth, why should not the other races feel ill-used and protest? If the yellow races are oppressed by the white races and have to revolt to avoid congestion and maintain existence, whose fault is it but the aggressors? If the white races truly love peace and wish to deserve the name of Christian nations, they will practice what they preach and will soon restore to us the rights so long withheld. They will rise to the generosity of welcoming our citizens among them as heartily as we do theirs among us. We appeal to the white races to put aside their race prejudice and meet us on equal terms in brotherly cooperation."

Mr. Dharmapala of India, speaking in Osaka, Japan, last July on "Japan's Duty to the World", said; "It is the 'White Peril' that the Asiatic races have to guard against. The White Peril is a reality; the Yellow Peril is only a phantom raised by European diplomacy to hoodwink Asia. How," he asks, "are we to subdue the arrogance of European races?" He urges Japan to lead Asia in the coming conflict with the white man.

China is at present most friendly to America. But how long will she remain so? When her people become as well versed in the affairs of the world as Japan and India are today; when she becomes conscious of the solidarity of white antipathy to Asiatics and to a treatment of Chinese contrary to our treaties and out of harmony with her dignity; when she learns of Californian anti-alien legislation and the refusal of America as a whole to let any Asiatics become citizens of this land, whatsoever their personal qualification, is it likely that China will maintain her friendship unbroken?

Against a solid anti-Asiatic white race, will there not inevitably arise a solid anti-white Asia? And will this not mean vast economic disaster to both East and West through military and naval expenses and interrupted or undeveloped commerce?

But the evils of protracted yellow and white perils are even more profound.

The two great streams of civilization, Occidental and Oriental, the product of milleniums of divergent evolution are in a large sense complementary. We Westerners easily see that we have much of value to give to the East. We do not so easily see that they have something of worth to give to us. Yet such, nevertheless, is the fact. But this mutual interchange of our best spiritual treasures cannot go forward on a basis of mutual suspicion, hatred and enmity. Only as friendship is established and maintained can we give them our best. This, moreover, is essential if we are to lift them to the level of our own life. It is no doubt true that, unless we elevate them to our own level, ultimately they will pull us down to theirs. Only on the basis of friendship too can we receive from them the best they have to give, thus enriching our own lives.

Such in barest outlines is the situation. A new era in human evolution has begun. The races and civilizations are face to face. This new era should be one of glorious interchange—an era of universal convergent evolution; but obstacles of race pride, aggression,

ambition, suspicion lie athwart our path. Perils, yellow and white, threaten the best interests of us all—East and West.

Many see no solution to the race problem save that of mutual exclusion. For the admission of Asiatics to America, as we admit immigrants from Europe, means, they assert, an Asiatic inundation. To such thinkers, complete surrender or complete segregation are the only alternative courses.

Just here however, lies the great mistake, for there is a third course. In briefest outline, it is a policy that provides for the gradual admission of Asiatics with provision for their education, assimilation and naturalization. By the early adoption of this policy, America can avoid both Sylla and Charibdis, devitalize both the yellow and white perils, and secure the inestimable advantages of the mutual exchange by East and West of their best. But at once someone will proclaim that Asiatics, and especially Japanese, are not assimilable. Though we admit them to our land, they will never become parts of our civilization nor really enter into our life. They are Oriental and we Occidental. Can oil and water mix? No more can East and West; and Kipling will be quoted;

> "Oh, East is East and West is West,
> And never the twain shall meet
> Till earth and sky stand presently
> At God's great judgment seat."

They, however, who quote these now famous lines, forget or never heard the lines that immediately follow:

> "But there is neither East nor West,
> Border nor breed nor birth,
> When two strong men stand face to face,
> Tho' they come from the ends of the earth."

There are indeed real differences between the East and the West, yet there is also real and still deeper unity. This question demands careful study. I pass accordingly to my second main topic, and ask:

II. ARE JAPANESE ASSIMILABLE?

If we admit Asiatics to our land, can and will they become truly American? If it indeed be true that the Japanese and Asiatics generally are not assimilable to our American civilization, then, of course, any plan for their admission to permanent residence in America and to naturalization, is out of the question.

Assimilation has two aspects—biological and social —to be sharply distinguished. In the one,through race intermarriage inherited race nature is combined and amalgamation takes place. The laws of the amalgamation are biological, operate spontaneously, and are wholly sub-conscious; the process is completed before the birth of the offspring. What occurs in those mysterious processes of generation and growth, our best science only dimly surmises. Their regulation is beyond human control.

In social assimilation, however, inherited race culture is transmitted both consciously and unconsciously, not only from parent to offspring, but from every influence that moulds thought, feeling and conduct. Social inheritance, given to the offspring only after birth, is a factor of superlative force in creating the personality of the individual. This inheritance is given, not by biological processes, but by education, by language, by every influence that moulds the heart and mind and will. Moreover, wholesome nurture, transmitting wholesome social inheritance, can alone provide the right environment in which human biological heredity can produce its best results.

This distinction between social and biological heredity and inheritance is of the highest importance in considering the problem of race assimilation. Civilization, mental habits of every kind, moral and religious ideas and ideals, with all the practices to which they lead, are matters of social, not of biological heredity and its processes. These are the factors which make a man to be the man he is. They form his mind, furnish the categories of his thinking, provide the motives and standards of his conduct, and, in a word, determine a man's race, sociologically speaking.

Now man's marvelous psychic nature provides that these things can be imparted to individuals of any race when they are young and plastic. Under ten or twelve, any child can completely learn any language, enter into any civilization, and become fully possessed of its social inheritance. Advancing years with loss of plasticity deprives one of this capacity. A full grown adult has almost no capacity for acquisition of new languages and civilizations. A man's personality is formed by the civilization in which he is reared.

The social assimilation of races, then, can proceed independently of their intermarriage. The Jews are a case in point. Sociologically speaking, Jews born and bred in America are Americans—biologically speaking, they are Hebrews.

Now from the standpoint of capacity to learn our language, acquire our ideas, and enter into our

corporate democratic life, young Japanese and Chinese are just as assimilable as are Italians or Russians, if we give them the same opportunity, the same welcome. Indeed, Asiatic children, reared in America, are more completely cut off from their social inheritance than are the children of any European people, because of the extraordinary difficulty of learning to read and speak Chinese and Japanese. Japanese children born in America can speak English freely, even though both parents are pure Japanese and are quite ignorant of English. In Hawaii, in spite of the large Japanese population and thousands of Japanese children for playmates, English is the language with which they play and quarrel.

The degree to which Japanese in California have already become Americanized, especially American-born children, is amazing to those who know them in Japan. The complete social assimilability of the Japanese is beyond question for anyone who will investigate the facts scientifically.

In regard to the question of the intermarriage of whites and Asiatics ignorant dogmatism prevails. Race antipathy and prejudice play a large role here. Yet it is a question which has not been carefully studied by experts. Intermarriage under wholesome and right relations is still limited. The disastrous results of the immoral sexual relations of the races should not be regarded as throwing light of any particular value on this problem.

We need, accordingly, a commission of expert biologists, sociologists and psychologists to collect and collate the facts already available that we may really know what are the biological consequences of race intermarriage. Personally I deprecate strongly the marriage of whites with Japanese. The differences of ideals as to the respective rights and duties of husband and wife are so great that the intermarriage of Americans and Japanese is a highly hazardous venture. Moreover, the biological results of such intermarriage are by no means clear. Many hold them to be as a rule bad. President Eliot contends that "pure races" are far superior. He asserts, moreover, that as a rule Japanese "do not intermarry with women of foreign races, affording thus a strong contrast to the white race in foreign parts. The question of immigration, therefore," he argues, "need not be complicated by any racial problem, provided that each of several races abiding in the same territory keeps itself pure, as the Japanese do, wherever they live."

But dogmatism is out of place. We need such scientific knowledge on this problem as can be col-

lected only by experts. The question of the wisdom of race intermarriage surely should not be left to the decision of individuals moved by momentary emotional impulses nor by ignorant dogmatism based on race prejudice. Full knowledge is required, and then if intermarriage is unwise we need an adequate national law forbidding it.

The question, therefore, of the intermarriage of whites and Asiatics can be and should be kept distinct from that of social assimilation. The latter can go forward independently of the former.

Accepting this result, we come to the third topic before us; to the statement, namely, of concrete propositions as to what we now should do for the solution of America's pressing Japanese problem.

III. OUTLINES OF A NEW ORIENTAL POLICY.

First of all I wish to say that I am in hearty agreement with the fundamental postulate of California's general Oriental policy. An immigration from Asia, swamping the white man, overturning the democratic institutions of the Pacific coast and ultimately of all America, or bringing wide economic disaster to Caucasian laborers and farmers, is not for a moment to be tolerated. California is right in her general policy. She is nevertheless wrong in her mode of applying that policy. Right in principle—wrong in method. She seeks to settle what is an international, nay, a universal problem in the light of exclusively local interests. Her solution in fact aggravates the difficulty, for it ignores pertinent facts, such as the actual diminution of Japanese residents in America due to the efficient administration by Japan of the Gentlemen's Agreement. It ignores also the willingness of Japan to accede to the fundamental desire of California. Her anti-alien legislation which, as Attorney-General Webb stated, "seeks to limit their (Japanese) presence by curtailing their privileges, for they will not come in large numbers nor long abide with us if they may not acquire land"—this legislation is accordingly needless; it is moreover humiliating to Japan; it is unscientific, unjust, short-sighted, and contrary to the spirit and substance of all American treaties with Japan.

The present Oriental policy of the United States as a whole also is in important respects humiliating to them and disgraceful to us. California's anti-alien legislation really rests back upon the refusal of our

Federal Government to grant rights of American citizenship to any individuals save "full white men" and men "of African descent."

Professing friendship in words, we deny it in important deeds. Demanding an open door for Americans in Asia and equality of opportunity for our citizens with that accorded to citizens of the "most favored nation", we do not ourselves grant the same to Asiatics in our land.

Here then is a serious situation. On the one hand California, conscious of a danger which she believes threatens to reach vast proportions if not radically and promptly dealt with. On the other hand, Japan, a nation with which America secured and has maintained exceptional relations of friendship, deeply wounded, yet earnestly desiring the maintenance of the historic friendship on a basis of dignity and mutual profit.

This is a difficult, delicate and intricate problem. Both sides have their measure of truth and right. The problem is how to harmonize these real rights and interests. How is it possible to grant what California so insistently and rightly demands and at the same time to secure to Japan what she demands with equal insistence?

The problem, however, is not so difficult as first appears. We need accurate knowledge as to the facts, clear thinking as to principles, the adoption of correct fundamental postulates and their consistent and wise elaboration into concrete policies and laws.

The new American Oriental policy must hold as its major premise the principles announced by President Wilson in that notable address at Mobile. He was speaking, it is true, with the South American nations in view, but the principles he announced apply equally to the nations of the Orient. As reported, he said:

"We must prove ourselves their friends and champions upon terms of equality and honor. You cannot be friends upon any other terms than upon the terms of equality.

"You cannot be friends at all except upon the terms of honor; and we must show ourselves friends by comprehending their interest, whether it squares with our interest or not.

"Human rights, national integrity and opportunity, as against material interests—that, ladies and gentlemen, is the issue which we now have to face.

"She (America) must regard it as one of the duties of friendship to see that from no quarter are material

interests made superior to human liberty and nationa opportunity."

On such principles consistently applied would we found America's new Oriental policy.

America should treat the Oriental on a basis of complete equality with the citizens of other races, granting to them the "most favored nation" treatment even as we give it to others and demand it for ourselves.

The policy needed is one that conserves all the permanent interests of California and the entire United States, and does so in harmony with the dignity of the peoples of the Orient and provides likewise for their permanent welfare.

A New General Immigration Law is needed which shall apply impartially to all races. We must abandon all differential Asiatic treatment, even as regards immigration. The danger of an overwhelming Oriental immigration can be obviated by a general law allowing a maximum annual immigration from any land of a certain fixed percentage of those from that land already here and naturalized. The valid principle on which such a law would rest is the fact that newcomers from any land enter and become assimilated to our life chiefly through the agency of those from that land already here. These know the languages, customs and ideals of both nations. Consequently, the larger the number already assimilated, the larger the number of those who can be wisely admitted year by year. The same percentage rate would permit of great differences in actual numbers from different lands.

By way of illusrating this suggestion consider the following outline of a General Immigration Law.

The maximum number of immigrants in a single year from any nation, race or group having a single "mother tongue" shall be:

(1) Five per cent of those from that land already naturalized American citizens, including their American-born children.

(2) In addition to these there shall also be admitted from any land all who are returning to America, having at some previous time had a residence here of not less than three years.

(3) All immediate dependent relatives of those who have had a residence here of not less than three years.

(4) All who have had an education in their own land equivalent to the American High School, with

not less than three years' study of some foreign tongue.

In the application of these provisions, individuals who come as bona fide travelers, government officials, students; in a word, all who are provided for by funds from their native land, should not be counted as immigrants; but all merchants, professionals, students, and all others who, even though not technically laborers, yet depend on their own efforts in this land for a living, should be so reckoned.

The immigration law suggested above would make it impossible for a new country like Patagonia or Tibet to get started, for it would have no naturalized citizens here from whom the five percent rate could be estimated. To make immigration possible for new countries it might be desirable to set an arbitrary limit—say five hundred or even one thousand immigrants per annum as a maximum for any country having less than 20,000 naturalized citizens in America.

Senator Dillingham proposed last June (1913) that annual immigration be allowed from any country up to ten percent of those from that land already here, yet allowing a minimum of five thousand to come from any land, however few may be their representatives in this country. The similarity of the writer's thought with that of the Senator's is apparent. Senator Dillingham proposes, however, to leave Asiatic Exclusion laws as they stand, making no effort to solve the difficult and highly important Asiatic problem.

The writer is not particularly concerned with defending the five percent rate here suggested. He merely uses it by way of illustration. Those better acquainted with the facts of immigration and the speed of social assimilation must determine just what percentage would be wise. The present contention centers on the point that whatever the wise rate may be it should be applied equally to all races. This principle alone avoids the difficulty of invidious race discrimination.

A Bureau of Alien Registration and Education is needed for the supervision of the education of all aliens. Every alien permanently residing in this country should be making steady preparation for citizenship; that is, for ability to live here intelligently and profitably both to himself and to us.

All aliens should be required to register in this Bureau, paying a substantial annual fee of, say $10, until naturalized. He should keep the Bureau informed of changes of residence. Failure to pay the annual fee or to keep the Registration Bureau in-

formed of changes of residence should be punishable by fines, and if persisted in should be a cause for deportation; and all unregistered aliens should be liable to deportation. Graded courses of study in American History, Politics, Civics, and English should be prepared, as well as some adequate presentation of the fundamental traits of American civilization, and opportunity should be given for annual examinations, free of charge. The annual registration fee might be diminished with each examination passed. Certificates of graduation should be essential for naturalization. Federal aid might be given to states, cities and towns providing facilities for alien education. Night schools might be opened in public school buildings. All institutions, such as Y. M. C. A.'s or churches providing systematic education for aliens along the lines of the Federal law might receive subsidies.

Of course, the establishment and development of such an undertaking would entail enormous work, expense and patience. Much common sense would be required to avoid needless red tape. Those in charge should ever seek to carry out the spirit. An incidental yet important advantage of this system would be the close knowledge by our authorities of aliens in their first years here and the ability to pick out and deport undesirables, such as anarchists, white-slave dealers, or flagrant criminals. No small part of our national difficulty with immigration has been our *laissez-faire* policy in regard to their education for citizenship. The method of registration would enable the authorities to detect and deport such as may have made their way into America illegitimately. The systematic care and education of all aliens in America is essential to the welfare of the country, of far more practical and also of pressing importance than our splendid educational enterprise in the Philippines.

The Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization might well be divided, and the functions of the latter modified and extended. The work and responsibility of granting naturalization to aliens should be taken away from courts which are not qualified for such a function and vested in a body specially constituted for that purpose. Every candidate for citizenship should present certificates of graduation in American History, Politics, Civics, English, and Principles of American Civilization. The Bureau of Naturalization should also secure from the Bureau of Registration, certificates of the good behavior and the moral fitness of candidates, granting naturalization only to those morally as well as educationally qualified.

A day might be set aside each year, perhaps the Fourth of July, on which to administer the oath of allegiance and to extend official welcome to all new citizens. Patriotic processions, banquets and speeches with appropriate pins, banners and badges, could make the event as important and significant as commencement exercises are in our colleges and universities.

A Fresh Definition of Eligibility for American Citizenship is needed. American Citizenship should be based on individual qualification. Race of itself should be neither a qualification nor a disqualification for citizenship. Let us raise the standards for citizenship as high as may be needed; but, whatever the standards are, let us apply them impartially. Whoever qualifies should be admitted.

Let such special legislation as may be needed, enabling Asiatic naturalization, be taken promptly by Congress.

The granting of rights of naturalization to all on a personal, not a racial, basis would go far toward solving the entire problem now pending with Japan. Existing anti-Japanese legislation of California and other states would at once be void. The Japanese nation and government would be intensely gratified, for they would recognize that America as a whole insists on justice and equality of treatment for Japanese in our land.

Japanese individuals who have taken the required courses of education for citizenship and are ready on the one hand to renounce openly their allegiance to Japan, and on the other to take the oath of allegiance to the United States, would without doubt make as loyal Americans as those who come from any other land.

Direct Federal Responsibility in all legal and legislative matters involving aliens is also essential. Aliens are guests of the nation, not of the states; and the nation is responsible to foreign governments for their just treatment. Foreign governments have no relation with the states, but only with the federal government. It is, therefore, the duty of the federal government to provide that the treaty rights of aliens are accorded them. It logically follows that legal proceedings involving aliens should be handled exclusively in federal, not in state courts. The nation must provide that treaty and other rights shall be accorded aliens, regardless of the ignorance or prejudice of unfriendly localities.

It might perhaps be wise by special provision to allow local courts to handle minor matters, such as

misdemeanors and transgressions of police regulations and city ordinances. The general principle, however, should be as stated above. To some this suggestion may seem a matter chiefly of theory, yet it is at this moment one of international importance. California and other states hide behind the national flag in their treatment of the citizens of Japan.

In 1864 the Japanese government failed to compel one of the clans to observe a recently made treaty allowing foreigners certain rights. Thereupon several of the Powers proceeded directly to the obstreperous clan and taught it a lesson on the importance of national unity and of obedience on the part of each clan to the international arrangements made by the central government.

The United States has for sixty years pledged her friendship and good-will to Japan. In several Pacific coast states legislation has been repeatedly proposed highly insulting and, if passed, seriously injurious to the citizens of Japan. All local legislation affecting differently the interests of citizens of other nations should be absolutely impossible.

A National Commission on Biological and Social Assimilation is needed. This should be a commission of expert biologists, physiologists and sociologists of international repute, and should be adequately financed. The results of such study should be embodied in national laws concerning (1) the intermarriage of individuals of different races; (2) the elimination by sterilization of those whose heredity renders procreation a menace to the nation; and (3) wise methods for Americanizing already compacted unassimilated groups of aliens.

There is no more intricate, and at the same time important problem confronting our country today than that of the intermarriage of the races.

We need rational national laws on this subject. It is absurd for California to have laws forbidding the marriage of Whites and Mongolians while Colorado does not. It is preposterous to make a crime in California what is perfectly legal in Colorado or Nevada. And the California law is of no practical effect, for she has to recognize the legitimacy of mixed marriages if performed outside of her own limits. If the California law rests on good scientific grounds, then it should be national; if it does not, then California should have no such law.

Systematic Education of Public School Children in Oriental History is another item in the writer's vision

of the new American Oriental policy. Indeed, for the general elimination of race prejudice education is needed in regard to the histories of all the peoples from whom immigrants come to our shores. Anthropological readers should be prepared, devoting one or more chapters to each race and people of whom representatives live in our land, written from an appreciative standpoint and setting forth the notable deeds of each. They should be well illustrated with fine engravings of the best representatives, dressed in modern European clothing in order to avoid those caricatures which are so common in pictures of strange peoples. Such readers would help the young to get over their spontaneous feelings of race antipathy.

The splendid deeds of heroism done by Jew and Spaniard, by Italian and Hungarian, French, German and English, Japanese, Chinese and Hindoo, should all be set forth with appreciation. Japan and China and India have had their illustrious histories no less than England, Germany and France. Should not the outstanding characters and achievements of these lands be taught to our young? George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Benjamin Franklin, and many English and European heroes of progress and high ideals are known, not only by name, but also for what they did, to all in Japan who have had a secondary education, and to all the higher classes in elementary schools. How many in our land, even college graduates, could tell anything whatever of Shotoku Taishi, Kusunoki Masashige, Nichiren, Shonen, and other great leaders in Japan? It is high time that the study of Oriental peoples and histories should be introduced into our public schools. It would help greatly to race reconciliation, even as kindly and truthful histories of the Civil War have done much to reconcile North and South.

I now sum up the various items in the proposed new American Oriental policy:

1. American citizenship should be granted to every qualified individual regardless of race.

2. Immigration from any land should be allowed on a percentage rate of those from that land already naturalized with their American-born children.

3. There should be a Bureau of Alien Registration and Education.

4. The granting of naturalization should be vested in a Bureau of Naturalization.

5. There should be direct Federal responsibility for all legal and legislative matters in which aliens as such are involved.

6. A National Commission should be appointed to study and report on the problems of Biological and Sociological Assimilation.

7. Children and young people in public schools should be educated in Oriental history.

Such are the outlines of a comprehensive policy for the treatment of all races and nations and the care of all resident aliens in our lands. To some it may perhaps seem a misnomer to call this plan a new Oriental policy, for it advocates nothing distinctive regarding Orientals. True! And this exactly is the reason for calling it our New Oriental Policy. It is a policy which does not discriminate against Asiatics, and, therefore, it is new. It is new both as to its spirit and as to its concrete elements.

The early adoption of some such policy as this is important. Until the whole Asiatic problem is fundamentally solved by national legislation, there is every reason to anticipate further aggressive anti-Japanese legislation by the Pacific Coast states. Further discriminative legislation, however, would still further alienate the friendly feeling of Japan and render still more complicated and difficult of solution the international situation. The early adoption of the main features of this policy would assure California on the one hand that no swamping Asiatic immigration is to be allowed, thus securing what she demands. Anti-Japanese legislation would no longer be desired by any responsible section of the people, and the cause of international friction would be removed. The adoption of such a policy would also satisfy and even please Japan, granting the substance of what she urges.

As regards the Chinese also the situation would be much improved. The fairness, yes, the generosity of our policy, adopted by us with no pressure from her side, would serve to strengthen and deepen the spirit of friendship for America and render still more effective American influence in guiding that new republic through the troublous times that are surely ahead.

If America can permanently hold the friendship and trust of Japan and China through just, courteous and kindly treatment, she will thereby destroy the anti-white Asiatic solidarity. If America proves to Asia that one white people at least does not despise the Asiatic as such nor seek to exploit them, but

rather on a basis of mutual respect and justice seeks their real prosperity, they will discover that what they feared as the "White Peril" may in fact be turned into an inestimable benefit. And that change of feeling will bring to naught the military "Yellow Peril" now dreaded by the whites.

America's new Oriental policy would go far toward instilling new principles into other nations and thus help mightily in the promotion of universal goodwill and the permanent peace of the world. These, however, are the essential conditions under which each race, nation and even tribe can make its own peculiar contribution to the richer life of the world.

Even from the lower standpoint of commercial and economic interests the policy of justice toward and friendship with the Orient is beyond question the right one. Armed conflict, or even merely sullen hostility, mightily hampers trade success. Rapid internal development in China and a rising standard of life among her millions means enormous trade with America, if we are friendly and just. And unselfish friendship and justice on our side will hasten the uplift of China's millions. Our own highest prosperity is inseparable from that of all Asia. So long as friendship is maintained and peace based on just international relations, the military yellow peril will be impossible. In proportion as the scale of living among Asia's working millions rises to the level of our own is the danger of an economic yellow peril diminished.

Every consideration, therefore, of justice, humanity and self-interest demands the early adoption of the general principles of this new Oriental policy. It conserves all the interests of the East and the West and is in harmony with the new era of universal convergent evolution of mankind.

Is not this a policy in which American Christians can unite? Japan looks to American Christians to carry out, in our national life, the policy of international justice and friendship to which we are pledged; pledged by the fact that we are Christian people, and also by the fact that Japan opened her doors sixty years ago to the promises we then made of permanent friendship.

In discussing California's recent legislation, Count Okuma has stated that this problem of the relation of the races is not one that can be solved by warfare, diplomacy or legislation, but only by the Christians of America applying their Christian principles to the practical problems of international life.

There are 23,000,000 professed Protestant Christians in America. Can we afford to let this appeal of Japan go unheeded?

The Christians of this country, united, can carry out such a program if they will. Christianity itself is at stake. Unless American Christians unitedly bestir themselves to Christianize our national treatment of the Asiatic, not only the success of Chrisian Missions in the Orient, but the sincerity of the world-wide missionary enterprise of the church and the vitality itself of the Christian life of our country will be profoundly affected.

Such is the call which as an American missionary long resident in Japan I make to the Christians of America on behalf, not of Japan alone, but also all of Asia; nor yet on behalf of Asia alone, but of the whole world, including our own beloved land. For on the right attitude of the West to the East hangs the fate of the whole world for centuries to come:

"Then let us pray that come it may,
As come it will for a' that,
That sense and worth o'er a' the earth
May bear the gree and a' that,
For a' that and a' that,
It's coming yet, for a' that,
THAT MAN TO MAN, THE WORLD O'ER
SHALL BROTHERS BE FOR A' THAT."

AN AFTER-WORD.

The outbreak of war in Europe emphasizes with terrible point the contention that international distrust and animosity lead to such development of armaments that it is only a matter of time till collisions occur. Two years ago the Balkan wars and now the whole European tragedy suggest what may happen fifty or a hundred years hence when Asia, armed and united and filled with fear of and hatred toward the white man, undertakes a war of vengeance and greed, and the white man either defends himself or retaliates.

If the armaments of Europe cannot guarantee peace between its own peoples, how can they guarantee the peace of the world, a world that has acquired the skill and the wealth made possible by modern civilization?

The problem of world-peace is the problem, not of peace treaties, arbitration clauses and Hague Courts, but of mutual goodwill and confidence among the nations. And this must now include the nations of Asia. How can this spirit be developed? If Asia fears and distrusts Christendom, Asia will arm. As Asia arms Christendom will increasingly fear and distrust her. Militarism will grow from decade to decade in every great land until a world conflict will be inevitable.

Does it not follow that the way to establish world-peace and to keep Asia from arming is for Christendom to act toward Asia in such ways as to make her trust us? But how can this be accomplished unless we **voluntarily** do her justice, keep our treaties and deal with all Asiatics who come to our lands in ways that we ourselves would like to be dealt by?

In a word, the international relations of nations, as of individuals, must be Christian if there is to be world-peace and wholesome growth. Nations must not only be just and honest, but they must be kindly and helpful in their international relations. This and this alone will evoke real goodwill and mutual trust between nations.

New York, Oct. 1, 1914.

No. 67.

BOOKS ON JAPAN

BY

PROF. SIDNEY L. GULICK, M.A., D.D.

EVOLUTION OF THE JAPANESE SOCIAL AND PSYCHIC

8 vo., fifth edition, 1905. $2.00. Revell Co., N. Y.

The late *Prof. William James*—"I cannot withhold the tribute of my admiration. It makes me understand the Japanese as I never did before. It is a real pleasure to find a book that holds from beginning to end to psychological principles and to the realities of human nature. . . . A genuine work of interpretation and a model for future studies in ethnic character."

Prof. Edmund Buckley (in American Journal of Sociology, University of Chicago)—"This work presents the best description and the most searching analysis that has yet appeared of that unique ethnical phenomenon, the modern reconstruction of Japan. As description, the work constitutes a very treasury of mental characterization so classified as to require nearly all of the thirty-seven chapters of the work."

THE WHITE PERIL IN THE FAR EAST

(Published at the time of the Russo-Japanese War.)
Revell Co., N. Y. $1.00.

The conclusions presented in this volume were gained from extended intimate acquaintance and conversation with Japanese men of affairs, with whom the author was in daily contact. He finds that the aggressiveness of the white race, their progressive civilization, the white man's greedy dreams of Oriental Empire, his haughty domineering spirit, are as real a cause of the war as the direct economic problems. There is a yellow peril for us, but it is not so threatening as the white peril for the Far East.

THE AMERICAN-JAPANESE PROBLEM

A Study of the Racial Relations of the East and West. Charles Scribner Sons, N. Y. $1.75.

A clear, impressive, and illuminating account of the situation in regard to the Japanese in California, and a thorough, scientific discussion of the possibilities of the Japanese in this country as immigrants and citizens. Dr. Gulick shows by illustration and argument the reasonable, honorable, and satisfactory solution of a difficult question. In a very interesting and entertaining way he discusses every side of the question, both from the Japanese and American point of view, and his conclusions, in regard to past events and future possibilities, are most valuable and important.